

CASE NO.: 50P4367
Serial No.: 09/840,326
July 7, 2005
Page 8

PATENT
Filed: April 23, 2001

Remarks

Reconsideration of the above-captioned application is respectfully requested. All pending claims (1-24) have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Williams et al., USPN 5,977,964, relying on the teaching at col. 7, lines 59-63 that a TV schedule is downloaded which shows only those shows that are available at the predicted access times. However, nothing in Williams et al. appears to teach or suggest that, apart from the static TV schedule (which cannot be fairly said to be "streams" of anything much less of A/V content), streams of A/V entertainment content are pushed to the viewer, in contrast to, e.g., amended Claim 1, support for which can be found in the specification at, e.g., page 18, last paragraph. Instead, the viewer of Williams et al. must affirmatively download content using the schedule, necessitating an additional user action.

Independent Claim 21 has not been amended because it is not believed that the relied-upon TV schedule of Williams et al. is downloaded from a predicted content source, but instead from a source of TV schedules that is not necessarily itself a source of the predicted content.

The fact that Applicant has focussed its comments distinguishing the present claims from the applied references and countering certain rejections must not be construed as acquiescence in other portions of rejections not specifically addressed.

The Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned at (619) 338-8075 for any reason which would advance the instant application to allowance.

1168-10.AMD

CASE NO.: 50P4367
Serial No.: 09/840,326
July 7, 2005
Page 9

PATENT
Filed: April 23, 2001

Respectfully submitted,



John L. Rogitz
Registration No. 33,549
Attorney of Record
750 B Street, Suite 3120
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

1168-10,AMD